



Continuation of rejections discussed: The overcoming of the final rejections by applicant's RCE amendment, the relocation of the Aoil and Aloil abbreviations to eliminate confusion in the claimed features about what the abbreviations represent, and the lack of a step which connects the desired preamble to the end result of the independent claims. Applicant's Attorney agreed to move the abbreviations to a location immediately following their respective definition in the claims, and to the inclusion of a step showing the connection between the originally recited preamble and the end result of the independent claims..

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Pramme rUS patent 6,107,796; Flaum et al., US patent 6,140,817; and the prior art techniques which use NMR to separate oil and water salad dressing emulsions with medium NMR relaxometers of 20MHz., The examiner notes that the prior art teach that the ability to determine the water fraction, oil fraction, or oil / water fraction of an emulsion with a low field NMR relaxometer has never proven to be a viable alternative. Low field relaxometer measurements of oil and water fractions have here to fore been unsuccessful according to the teachings of the prior art. In the prior art techniques and apparatuses the only thing that is determined is either if water, oil, and other components are present in a sample, or an estimate, (i.e. a guess) about the fractional amount of the oil / water components. The prior art fails to make direct low NMR relaxometer measurements that are accurate determinations of the fractional amount of oil and water in a fluid emulsion. .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney to discuss the RCE claims, and the teachings of the prior art in order to ensure that the earlier applied prior art, as a result of applicant's RCE amendments was no longer applicable to the pending claims. Additionally, the examiner wanted to discuss the grammatical flow of applicant's claimed limitations, to ensure that the features claimed were clearly recited. In discussions with the attorney the examiner noted features that applicant taught in the specification, but did not clearly recite in the claims. The attorney agreed to work with the examiner to address the examiner's concerns by clarifying the features already claimed by original disclosure. The attorney proposed changes to the claim language to address the examiner's concerns, and gave the examiner permission to perform an examiner's amendment to the claims, and specification in accordance with the proposal, in order to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner notes that the examiner amended changes are free of new matter, since applicant's original disclosure has original support. .